1:Spier E-5 (1929-1932) 1933 NT15 River Yumans NT15
Maricopa

601 ins follows from this, but only in part. True enough a father's brother's children and a woman's mother's sister's children are called brothers and sisters when the father and his brother or the mother and her sister are half-siblings by the same mother. But instead of calling these parallel cousins brother and sister as well when the parents are full brothers and sisters, they use special terms for them.

[611] The reason for considering half-siblings as full siblings when derived from the same mother but not from the same father is inexplicable, especially in face of the marked patriliny prevailing otherwise in their social structure. Obviously, with different fathers these children may have belonged to different sibs, hence the blood-bond here overrides sib affiliation. Informants were wholly at a loss to find any correlated social function. It seems that it must be correlated in some way which I do not understand [606] with the importance of the two mothers-in-law in determining the relation of their child's spouse to their own families, to the [587] function of the mother-in-law in supplying a woman of her own family to the widower son-in-law, and to the attitude of considering women as essentially the carriers of patrilineal sib affiliations; but the clue to their interrelation is lacking. It might be thought to be based on a belief that a woman alone was concerned in conception, the man's part being secondary. But nothing of the sort developed in a long discussion of the relation of conception to dreams nor in the many other opportunities when it might have come out.

Sex, on the other hand, is not an important basis of classification. The speaker's sex does make a difference, to be sure, but rarely that of the kinsman addressed. It is partially ignored between brothers and sisters and with cousins of one's own generation. It is practically ignored in one's children's generation, and does not figure at all in the generation of grandchildren and greatgrandchildren.

---

[171] River tribes reckon half-siblings as full siblings when the bond is through the mother, but we are not told so. Similarly it may be that this blood bond figures in the classification of parallel cousins, as it does in Maricopa, but these authorities are also silent on this point.

1:Spier E-5 (1929-1932) 1983 NT15 River Yumans NT15
Maricopa

the extension of that word. (However, these words also mean a man's sibling's grandchild and grandparent's brother.) Reciprocal usage accounts for the same stem in son-in-law (ĭṇgwaxl,-âau'â) and wife's parent (ĭnxĭl,âau'), but it is not clear why the wife's parents are not grouped with her other relatives. The sororate accounts for another exception: the words for wife's sister (ĭnyahwĭ') and a woman's sister's husband (ĭnkwĭnyâhweya') are similar.[59] The levirate is not reflected in any analogous way. It will be observed that the grouping of relatives by marriage does not follow sib lines. There are no terms in use between the parents of a couple, for a parents' sister's husband, nor for step-siblings. They are not related. While some of the cousins of the collateral lines in the speaker's generation are called brothers or sisters, their spouses are not called by brother- or sister-in-law terms. The wives among them are called by the names of their sibs.

One feature of some western systems is absent here, namely, the change of a term on the death of the connecting relative. However, after the death of a husband or wife, the terms for their relatives are dropped: they are no longer related.

Verbal reciprocity is only weakly developed. The following reciprocals occur:

nâvi', father's older brother
nâpi', father's sister
nâgwo', maternal grandfather

nâkĭtc, grandparent's brother, step-father
cĭn,âkĭ's, grandparent's sister
ĭnxĭl,âau', wife's parent
ĭnkunyi', husband's parent, husband's sibling, husband's grandparent, a woman's step-child
ĭnyahwĭ', wife's sister

dŏkxămi'k, a man's father's brother's child

vĕta', a man's younger brother's child
mĕxâpi', a woman's brother's child
xaxgω'g, ŏxko', a man's daughter's child
kitca', a man's sibling's grandchild, a man's step-child
akĭ's, a woman's sibling's grandchild
ĭngwaxl,âau'â, son-in-law
unyi', son's wife, brother's wife, grandson's wife, step-mother

ĭnkwĭnyâhweya', woman's sister's husband

[59] They are probably more nearly alike than they are written; this was not checked. Together they are cognates of Mohave inyahuvik, wife's sister and woman's sister's husband (*ibid.*).

1:Spier E-5 (1929-1932) 1933 NT15 River Yumans NT15
Maricopa

The levirate was compulsory; the sororate common but not wholly obligatory. The levirate was compulsory, I was told, because the woman was a member of her husband's family and they did not want to give her up. It made no difference whether or not she had borne him children. If her deceased husband had no brother (there was no rule of junior or senior levirate), she must marry one of his relatives, sometimes her father-in-law. More commonly it was his father's brother's son or his brother's son (but not his sister's son); that is, someone of his family and sib. If the brother already had a family, she commonly married the parallel cousin. She might not like the brother and might marry outside the family, but this was regarded as disobedience of her obligation: she was willful like a child. 587

The sororate was customary rather than obligatory. When the wife died, her mother supplied in her place a sister of the dead woman (almost inevitably a younger sister) or some other relative of her own family. This might be her mother's sister's daughter, but not her mother's brother's daughter, nor any feminine relative of the father-in-law. In this case the second spouse was not of necessity of the same sib as the first, but it exactly parallels the case of the levirate where the substitute husband is by male linkage a member of the deceased husband's father's family, not his mother's. If the younger sister did not like the widower, she need not marry him. In earlier times a man did not marry his mother-in-law, but there is at present a case of this.

A few widows and widowers remarried only a few months after the death of their spouses, but it was usual to wait a year or two. Some never married again. [589]

Plural marriages were not common. Some men had three or four wives. "Yet such a man would nevertheless go starving all day long!" each of his wives thinking the others had provided for him. He was not necessarily a handsome man; it happened rather because he had dreamed of the mocking-bird. He seemed handsome in his dream. He dreamed of the orange-winged blackbird and the mocking-bird(?), who are friends and always in pursuit of women. They have a big house so full of wives that they 595 787

1:Spier E-5 (1929-1932) 1933 NT15 River Yumans NT15
Maricopa
Halchidhoma

enough, "Perhaps she wants something to eat or wear that I can not give her," and let her go to her lover. He made no attempt to harm either of them. But he would never have anything to do with her thereafter. 593 837 [586]

X left his first wife, who took her infant son with her when she married a Kohuana. The Kohuana could not have been more fond of the boy had he been his own son. For instance, when the lad was returning from a visit to the Mohave, he injured his foot badly. His companions who came ahead reported that he might die of thirst in the desert. The Kohuana step-father immediately rode out to fetch him. X would have nothing to do with his ex-wife. He always drove the lad away with a stick and extended this unkindness to his son's children. People now ask why those children care for X, now that he is old, since he treated them so badly, but they reply simply that he is their relative and needs their help. 593

Women fought to retain the affections of unfaithful husbands. If a man was repeatedly remiss, his wife would give him up to her rival. If she left him for this reason, he might try to persuade her to return but she would refuse. She went to her relatives to live, because her husband was bringing a new wife to his home. However, if they had children, the wife would stay with her children. If nevertheless she decided to marry again, she told no one, not even the children, whom she abandoned there. Such abandonment is confirmed by an incident related below. 586 [837] 587

Ordinarily a barren wife was divorced. It was a common saying that a home was incomplete without children. Occasionally the wife might be kept if she was good-natured and industrious, and an additional wife might be taken. Both sexes were known to be impotent: they were called yĕsa'a'n. 586 [833]

Much the same attitude was displayed to a wife who bore girls. Girl babies were not wanted: they always said a girl was an enemy, because she might some day be married to an enemy and tell how to attack her own people. If the wife of a first marriage bore a girl first, her husband discarded her; but if she bore a boy, his people praised her. 842 586

While the Halchidhoma were still on the Colorado, a woman bore no children, so her husband sent her away. She married another man—it was his first marriage—and bore him a girl. His family made him put her away and take another wife. The woman said it was not right to raise a girl who had no father, implying it was no better than a bastard. It ought to be killed; so she threw the baby into the river. [847]

1:Spier E-5 (1929-1932) 1933 NT15 River Yumans NT15
Maricopa
Halchidhoma
Yuma
Mohave

768 moved to a new locality, where a new house was built. This
[166] habit seems to have led to a constantly shifting occupation of the Gila valley, much accelerated by the epidemics incident to the coming of the whites.

765 The relatives would mourn for four days following the death. At the end of the fourth day, they were always visited by an older person who talked to them, admonishing them not to think of their dead relative for fear they might also sicken. He tried to get them to efface it from their minds. For this reason, there was no mourning ceremony, according to my Halchidhoma informant; but he later described the very full rite given below. After four days they resumed their normal occupations.

765 Purification (mataraĕ'k) was necessary for the mourning rel-
783 atives, the speech-maker, and everyone else who had touched or tended the corpse. They threw all the clothing they wore into the pyre and went to bathe. (In fact, everyone who was present threw at least one article into it before leaving the spot.) On reaching home, before going to bed, they built a little fire on which arrowweeds were lain to smoke themselves. For four days
[262] they abstained from meat and salt, bathing each morning. Mourning relatives singed their hair short, not close.[1] The length
[587] of mourning was not fixed: some widows and widowers remarried within a few months, but it was usual to wait a year or two.

I several times observed an old woman walking alone wailing or rather groaning for relatives who had died some time before. But when she reached the house of her niece, where I was, she left off abruptly. I was told that she grieved all the time and that she dreamed of the dead.

551 The objection to naming the dead was very strong, so much so
769 that it was very difficult to obtain genealogical material. This was not an absolute tabu but a strong repugnance. As elsewhere among Indians, mentioning a man's dead relatives (called nĭctcĭm'g) was comparable to cursing him. Kutox, commenting on this, said, "But every time I hurt myself I say, 'I have no grandmother; I have no grandfather.' Soon I will be with my dead relatives so I do not mind speaking of them."

[184] [1] Purification of mourners by bathing and smoking also occurred among the Yuma (Gifford, *Yuma Dreams*, p. 66) and the Mohave purified themselves by smoke in the scalp dance (Kroeber, *Handbook*, p. 752).